UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/667,808	09/22/2003	Andrew Doddington	14846-16	2172

7590 05/17/2007	EXAMINER
MICHAEL B. JOHANNESEN, ESQ.	
LOWENSTEIN SANDLER, P.C.	OMOSEWO, OLUBUSOLA
65 LIVINGSTON AVENUE	
ROSELAND, NJ 07068	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2168	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
05/17/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *21 February 2007*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-15* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

    Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All   b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)

2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)

3)☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date *1-22-07*.

4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
    Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.

5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application

6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1.   This action is responsive to communication: Amendment, filed on 02/21/2007.

2.   Claims 1 has been amended. Claims 12-15 are new.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3.   The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim1-15 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 1, 14 and 15 claims the executing said operation on first processor/ first service application in said distributed processing system and executing said nested operation on a second processor/second service application in said distributed processing system", however, it is unclear if the operation and nested operation are the same. Proper clarification is need.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or
described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject
matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a
whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having
ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

5.   Claims 1-15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by
Norton et al. (U.S 20030140332) hereinafter "Norton" in the view of Fuh et al.
(20040073870) hereinafter "Fuh" and further in view of Crawford et al. (Patent No.
5,261095) hereinafter "Crawford".

For claim 1, Norton teaches "a method for use in a distributed processing system to
specify an application service comprising; defining a schema comprising an operation
having a plurality of arguments, the schema having a nested operation" (See paragraph
[0027], code sample 1 and 4)

Norton does not explicitly teach, "Validating said the operation's signature"

However, Fuh teaches "Validating said the operation's signature" (See paragraph
[0057-0095], fig.4&16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention
to modify Norton with teachings of Fuh to make sure documents fit within the described

model of a class of documents and also ensure the compliance prior to their use in data

storage and processing.

Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "Executing said operation on first processor in

said distributed processing system and executing said nested operation on a second

processor in said distributed processing system".

However, Crawford teaches "Executing said operation on a first processor in said

distributed processing system and executing said nested operation on a second

processor in said processing system" ([Col. 2, lines 3-7, Col. 2, lines 37-42]

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to

combine teachings of Norton and Fuh with Crawford's teachings of partitioning a

computer software program and using more than one processor. Crawford teaches,

multiple processor; each capable of independent action. Wherein the combination of

Norton, Fuh and Crawford could enhance executing a schema operation on different

processors and also validating the operation on each processor with each processor

optimized to perform its assigned task, which results in the program execution time

been substantially reduced.

For claim 2, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above

for rejected claim 1 above. Norton and Crawford do not explicitly teach "comprising

validating the operation's payload after validation of the contents of the payload".

However, Fuh teaches "comprising validating the operation's payload after validation of

the contents of the payload" (See paragraph [0057-0095], fig.4&16).

For claim 3, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Norton teaches " wherein defining a schema comprising an operation having a plurality of arguments comprises defining a schema having a plurality of nested operation" (Code sample 1).

For claim 4, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 3 above. Norton teaches "wherein defining a schema comprising an operation having a plurality of nested operations comprises defining a schema having one or more nested operations in one or more of said nested operations" (Code sample 1-3).

For claim 5, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 2 above. Norton and Crawford do not explicitly teach "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said nested operation".

However, Fuh teaches "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said nested operation" (See paragraph [0057-0095], fig.4&16).

For claim 6, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 3 above. Norton and Crawford do not explicitly teach "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said plurality of nested operations".

However, Fuh teaches "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said plurality of nested operations"(See paragraph [0057-0095], fig.4&16).

For claim 7, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 4 above. Norton and Crawford do not explicitly teach "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said one or more of said nested operation in one or more of said nested operations".

However, Fuh teaches "wherein validating said schema further includes validating said one or more of said nested operation in one or more of said nested operations"(See paragraph [0057-0095], fig.4&16).

For claim 8, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Norton teaches "the step of generating a program to perform the defined operation" (See paragraph [0006-0010]).

For claim 9, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "the step of distributing operations to one or more members of the distributed system".

However, Crawford teaches "the step of distributing operations to one or more members of the distributed system" ([Col. 2, lines 3-7, Col. 2, lines 37-42]).

For claim 10, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 9 above. Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "wherein said step of defining a schema includes indicating one or more points where distributing operations is beneficial".

However, Crawford teaches "wherein said step of defining a schema includes indicating one or more points where distributing operations is beneficial" ([Col. 1,lines 13-25]).

For claim 11, this claim is rejected on grounds corresponding to the argument give above for rejected claim 1 above. Norton teaches "wherein the step of defining a schema comprises defining a schema in XML" (Code sample 1).

For claim 12, Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "wherein said operation and said nested operation are calls from a client application to a service application".

However, Crawford teaches "wherein said operation and said nested operation are calls from a client application to a service application"([Col. 4, lines 27-46])

For claim 13, Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teaches "wherein said step of executing said operation further includes the steps of executing said operation at a first service application and executing said nested operation at a second service application".

However, Crawford teaches "wherein said step of executing said operation further includes the steps of executing said operation at a first service application and

executing said nested operation at a second service application"([Col. 2, lines 3-7, Col.

2, lines 37-42])

For claim 14, Norton teaches "defining a schema comprising an operation having a

plurality of arguments, the schema having a nested operation and said nested operation

representing calls from a client application to a service application". (See paragraph

[0027], code sample 1 and 4)

Norton does not explicitly teach "Validating said the operation's signature".

However, Fuh teaches "Validating said the operation's signature" (See paragraph

[0057-0095], fig.4&16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the

invention to modify Norton with teachings of Fuh to make sure documents fit within the

described model of a class of documents and also ensure the compliance prior to their

use in data storage and processing.

Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "Executing said operation in said distributed

processing system".

However, Crawford teaches "Executing said operation in said distributed processing

system"([Col. 2, lines 3-7, Col. 2, lines 37-42])

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to

combine teachings of Norton and Fuh with Crawford's teachings of partitioning a

computer software program and using more than one processor. Crawford teaches,

multiple processor; each capable of independent action. Wherein the combination of

Norton, Fuh and Crawford could enhance executing a schema operation on different processors and also validating the operation on each processor with each processor optimized to perform its assigned task, which results in the program execution time been substantially reduced.

For claim 15, Norton teaches "defining a schema comprising an operation having a plurality of arguments, the schema having a nested operation". (See paragraph [0027], code sample 1 and 4)

Norton does not explicitly teach "Validating said the operation's signature".

However, Fuh teaches "Validating said the operation's signature" (See paragraph [0057-0095], fig.4&16).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in that art at the time of the invention to modify Norton with teachings of Fuh to make sure documents fit within the described model of a class of documents and also ensure the compliance prior to their use in data storage and processing.

Norton and Fuh do not explicitly teach "Executing said operation at a first service application in said distributed processing system and executing said nested operation at a second service application in said distributed processing system".

However, Crawford teaches "Executing said operation at a first service application in said distributed processing system and executing said nested operation at a second service application in said distributed processing system"([Col. 2, lines 3-7, Col. 2, lines 37-42]

Therefore it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to combine teachings of Norton and Fuh with Crawford's teachings of partitioning a computer software program and using more than one processor. Crawford teaches, multiple processor; each capable of independent action. Wherein the combination of Norton, Fuh and Crawford could enhance executing a schema operation on different processors and also validating the operation on each processor with each processor optimized to perform its assigned task, which results in the program execution time been substantially reduced.

Response to Argument

6.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims1-15 have been considered but are

moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

CONCLUSION

7.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the

examiner should be directed to OLUBUSOLA ONI whose telephone number is 571-272-

2738. The examiner can normally be reached on 10.00-6.30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, TIM VO can be reached on 571-272-3642. The fax phone number for the

organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the

Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for

published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR.

Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should

you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic

Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a

USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information

system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

OLUBUSOLA ONI
Examiner
Art Unit 2168

TIM VO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100